



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/321,743

05/28/1999

LEE C. HAROLD

53470.000012

6991

29315

7590

05/22/2002

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
ONE FOUNTAIN SQUARE
11911 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/321,743

Applicant(s)

HAROLD ET AL.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4, 5, 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application, filed 05/28/99;
2. Claims 1-23 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 3-4, 12-13, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "lever" in claims 3, 12, and 20 appears to be typographical error which should read "level".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 7, 10-13, 16-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ainsbury et al., US Patent 6,078,924, 6/20/2000 (filed 6/30/98) and further in view of Clancey et al., US Patent 6,134,563, 10/17/00 (filed 9/19/97).

In reference to claims 1, 10, and 18, Ainsbury teaches a method and apparatus for information browsing, querying, analysis, and report creation. Ainsbury discloses a method of providing a document analysis using an OLAP query. See column 7, lines 22-42. Ainsbury further discloses a visualization control in which a user can provide various ways to view data elements and an analysis template which allows for analysis on specific topics (compare to ***"report requesting. . .processing by the OLAP system"***). Ainsbury does not disclose a formatting for a workbook comprising one or more reports; however, Clancey teaches a method where a user can define and customize reports within a workbook. See abstract, column 9, lines 9-11 and figures 1 and 2a-2b. Clancey's method includes opening a workbook of reports (spreadsheet application) and formatting the reports such that the various statements (pages) or sections can be customized or formatted (compare to ***"format specification. . .each report in the workbook"***). See column 9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow a user to request a workbook since a workbook is simply a collection of reports and to format the reports within the workbook since it was well known at the time the invention was made to customize the appearance of report pages.

In reference to claims 2, 11, and 19, Ainsbury does not teach multiple levels of formats; however, Clancey teaches a system in which a user can set project globals upon opening a workbook. The system's default is set to the global format. See column 9, lines 13-25. The user can then control the actions and formatting of the reports with the editing tools of the system. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a mechanism by which the user could edit the reports at various levels ranging in a default global level to the attribute level since it was well known at the time of the invention for a user to edit various sections or pages of a spreadsheet application (workbook).

In reference to claims 3, 12, and 20, Ainsbury does not disclose a hierarchical level format in which the lower level formats override the higher level formats; however it is implicit in Clancey's system that the lower level formats override the higher levels. In particular, Clancey discloses a default global format; however, upon a user's adjustment or customization of the report, the format of a particular portion or page is implemented. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have lower level formats supersede higher level formats since the lower level formats are specific to a particular report or attribute.

In reference to claims 4 and 13, Ainsbury does not teach the various levels of formats; however, Clancey teaches a global format that is the default format of presentation. See column 9. In regards to report, attribute/element/metric, and value formats, Clancey's system allows the user to manipulate content and appearance of the analysis separate from the underlying calculations or representations. Since formatting the reports for presentation at various levels was well known at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate formats separately for report, attribute/element, and value levels.

In reference to claims 7 and 16, Ainsbury does not teach a user specifying rules; however, Clancey discloses an editor objects consisting of contexts, parameters, values, hierarchies, and the rules relating them. See column 6, lines 49-67. Extending Ainsbury's system to incorporate Clancey's format rules would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made since it is simply another method by which a user can specify format for reports in a workbook.

In reference to claims 8, 17, and 23, Ainsbury does not teach a format of the report comprising an auto format; however, Clancey teaches a default global format that is applied to all reports when the report is received. The user can set the project globals. See column 9, lines 15-25 and figure 3a. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an auto format or default format in which the user can specify the globals since the recipient may desire one generic format of all reports received.

7. Claims 5-6, 9, 14-15, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ainsbury et al., US Patent 6,078,924, 6/20/2000 (filed 6/30/98) and further in view of Clancey et al., US Patent 6,134,563, 10/17/00 (filed 9/19/97), as applied to claims 1, 10, and 18 above, and further in view of Siow et al., US Patent 6,301,590, 10/9/2001 (filed 8/11/97).

In reference to claims 5, 14, and 21, Ainsbury and Clancey's system jointly does not disclose a format of a merged report; however, Siow discloses a system in which the user can specify multiple reports and format for the display of the multiple reports on a single page. See column 9, lines 32-61. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's system of merging reports into Ainsbury's and Clancey's system since it allows a user to present information from multiple reports within a workbook in a single presentation.

In reference to claims 6, 15, and 22, Ainsbury and Clancey's system jointly does not teach a format in which the report comprises a combined grid and graph; however, Siow discloses a system for formatting and displaying reports from data on the Internet. The data is obtained for a report by accessing a data repository. Moreover, Siow's apparatus allows the user to specify multiple reports and a format for the display of multiple reports in a single page. For example, a tabular and a chart format may be used. The user can view the data in multiple different graphical presentations. See column 9, lines 30-62. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's system of report formatting with multiple presentations with Ainsbury's and Clancey's system of report generation since it provides the user with more display options which was well known at the time the invention was made.

In reference to claim 9, Ainsbury and Clancey's system does not teach a scripted format created by the user; however, Siow discloses a system for formatting and displaying reports from data on the Internet. The data is obtained for a report by accessing a data repository. Siow discloses using script language to format the report. See column 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's method of formatting a report obtained

from data in a repository into Ainsbury's system for requesting and formatting reports in a workbook since using script language for formatting was well known in the art.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beller US Patent 5,852,819 12/22/98

Anand et al. US Patent 5,692,181 11/25/97

Lore et al. US Patent 6,163,774 12/19/00 (filed 5/24/99)

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh at 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at 703.308.5186.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

After-Final 703.746.7238
Official 703.746.7239
Non-Official/Draft 703.746.7240

Application/Control Number: 09/321,743
Art Unit: 2176

Page 8

Rachna Singh
May 16, 2002


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER